

Remarks

Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and following remarks. Claims 1, 11 and 23 are amended. Amendments to claims 1, 11 and 23 are supported, for instance, in Figures 1, 2A-2B, and 9 and in descriptions thereof from Applicants' specification. Claim 31-32 have been added. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-14 and 23-32 are pending.

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's time in conducting the interview with Applicants' representative Mr. Bryan Wong (Reg. 50,836) on May 24, 2005. In the interview, independent claims 1, 11 and 23 were discussed against the prior art rejections and particularly cited reference Hayashi (U.S. Patent No. 6,595,710) was discussed. Generally, Applicants proposed arguments against the prior art and proposed potential claim amendments to further distinguish the prior art. No agreement was reached, however, the Examiner expressed that the amendments as proposed herein could be allowable, and particularly with respect to at least claims 11 and 23.

Claims 1, 3-6, 11-14, 23, 25, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hayashi (U.S. Patent No. 6,595,710). Applicants' respectfully traverse this rejection to the extent it is maintained.

Claim 1 recites a supply item where the first end of at least one of the supply cylinder or the take-up cylinder defines an inner perimeter where the first end is partially closed when viewed in an end plan view. The first opening at the first end of the supply cylinder or the take-up cylinder is disposed within the inner perimeter. The first opening includes an area less than an area of the second opening at the second end of the supply cylinder or the take-up cylinder. The features of claim 1 provide a supply item with a reduced area configuration between opposite ends of a cylinder that facilitates loading in the correct orientation. (Page 5, lines 5-9.) The supply item features provide a convenient and efficient device that simplifies supply item replacement. (Page 5, lines 24-29.)

Hayashi does not teach or suggest the features required by claim 1. Hayashi is directed to a facsimile carrier cartridge 20 provided with a core tube 41 having notched mating grooves 60 and cutout locking grooves 62. (Figures 8 and 12(b).) The grooves are disposed at an end of the core tube and extend outward from the hollow opening of the core tube. (Figure 8.) Hayashi does not disclose, however, a supply item where the first end of at least one of the supply cylinder or the take-up cylinder defines an inner perimeter that partially closes the first end when viewed in an end plan view. Hayashi does not teach or suggest that the first opening at the first end of the supply cylinder or the take-up cylinder is disposed within the inner perimeter, and does not disclose the first opening that includes an area that is less than an area of the second opening at the second end of the supply cylinder or the take-up cylinder. In fact, Hayashi provides a cylinder with openings having areas that are the same at both ends. Hayashi merely provides notches at an end of its core tube that terminate axially and extend from the hollow opening of the core tube. The cited reference does not disclose a cylinder having a first opening disposed within an inner perimeter of a first end that partially closes the first end, where the opening has an area less than an area of an opening of the second end. Thus, claim 1 is distinguishable from Hayashi.

Claim 11 recites a carrier where both the first and second ends of the supply spindle and the take-up spindle are disposed on one side of the handle portion. The first and second ends of both spindles are disposed on the same side of the handle portion. The features of claim 11 provide advantages for a carrier in which both the first and second ends of the spindles reside on one side of the handle, such that better protection may be afforded to the supply and take-up spindles. (Figures 1, 2A and 3.)

Hayashi does not disclose the features of claim 11. Particularly, Hayashi does not teach or suggest the first and second ends of both the supply spindle and the take-up spindle being disposed on one side of the handle portion. Hayashi does not teach or suggest the feature of both ends of both spindles being disposed on the same side of the handle portion, such as for instance the end proximate the free end of the pin

58 to the end of the spindle 60 adjacent the gear 62. (Applicants' Figure 1 and Page 7, line 28 to Page 8, line 4.) In fact, Hayashi provides a complex spool connection 38 where a first rotation member 46 and shaft member 48 permanently engage through a shaft hole 50. (Figures 4, 8 and 9.) (Col. 13, lines 1-6.) Thus, Hayashi provides a spool with rotation and shaft members inserted through a shaft hole. Hayashi does not teach, however, first and second ends of both a supply and take-up spindle disposed on one side of the handle portion and at the same side. For at least these reasons, claim 11 is distinguishable from Hayashi.

Claim 23 recites a combination of the supply item and carrier where the supply spindle is insertable through the second end toward the first end of the supply cylinder such that the first pin is receivable by the first geometry of the supply cylinder first end. (Figure 2A and Page 9, lines 17-23.) The take-up spindle is insertable through the second end toward the first end of the take-up spindle, such that the second pin is receivable by the second geometry of the take-up cylinder first end. (Figure 2A and Page 9, lines 17-23.) The features of claim 23 provide a combination that can require fewer parts, and facilitates proper and convenient loading of the supply item onto the carrier from one side of the carrier. (Figures 2A, 2B.)

Hayashi does not teach or suggest the features required by claim 23. The cited reference does not provide a supply and a take-up spindle that are respectively insertable through the second end toward the first end of the supply cylinder and take-up cylinder. Hayashi does not disclose spindles insertable through the cylinders where the pins are respectively receivable by the geometries of the cylinder first ends. In fact, Hayashi provides a complex cartridge configuration where four spool assemblies 36, 37, 38 and 39 are employed to load an ink sheet 21 onto the cartridge. The spool assemblies are employed to connect at opposite ends of the core tubes. Hayashi does not teach a spindle that extends from the second end of a cylinder toward the first end, such that a pin on the spindle is respectively receivable by the geometry of the first end of the cylinder. Thus, claim 23 is distinguishable from Hayashi.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 1, 11, 23 are allowable over Hayashi. Claims 3-6, 12-14, 25, and 26 respectively depend upon and further limit claims 1, 11 and 23. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that these claims are patentable over the reference cited for at least the same reasons and need not be separately distinguished at this time. Applicants reserve the right to file additional arguments at a later date specifically addressing any of claims 3-6, 12-14, 25, and 26.

Favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Claims 2, 7-10, 24, and 27-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayashi (above) in view of de la Reguera (U.S. Patent No. 6,422,770). Applicants' respectfully traverse this rejection to the extent it is maintained.

Hayashi has been discussed in detail. The features of claims 1, 11, and 23 have been discussed in detail.

Reguera does not provide what is missing from Hayashi. Reguera also employs notches 28, 34 at ends of supply spool 14 and take-up spool 16. (Figures 3, 4.) The notches receive drive lugs from a support spindle to drive the cylinder for positive advancement of a ribbon. (Col. 4, lines 52-64.) For similar reasons as above, de la Reguera does not teach or suggest the features of claims 1, 11 and 23. Thus, the cited reference does not remedy the deficiencies of Hayashi. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 11 and 23 are patentable over Hayashi and de la Reguera either alone or in combination. Claims 2, 7-10, 24, and 27-30 respectively depend upon claims 1 and 23. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that these claims are patentable over the references cited for at least the same reasons and need not be separately distinguished at this time. Applicants reserve the right to file additional arguments at a later date specifically addressing any of claims 2, 7-10, 24 and 27-30.

Favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

App. No. 10/613,186
Examiner: K. Williams
Art Unit: 2854

PATENT
HSM&L No. 02968.0233USU1

Regarding new claims 31 and 32, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims depend upon and further limit claim 23, discussed above as allowable. Thus, claims 31 and 32 are patentable for at least the foregoing reasons and need not be separately distinguished at this time. Applicants reserve the right to file additional arguments at a later date specifically addressing claims 31 and 32.

In view of the above, Applicants believe that the claims are allowable. Favorable reconsideration in the form of a Notice of Allowance is requested. Any questions or concerns regarding this communication can be directed to the undersigned attorney at (612) 455-3800.

Respectfully submitted,

HAMRE, SCHUMANN, MUELLER
& LARSON P.C.
P.O. Box 2902-0902
Minneapolis, MN 55402
612.455.3800

Dated: June 3, 2005

By



James A. Larson
Reg. No. 40,443

JAL:BAW